To the second point that you have raised, namely, the hardships that the *Kandukrishi* tenants are suffering from, Government will give their earnest attention, and the memorials sent to Government will be considered.

6. Disposal of land.

MR. PARIATHU PAKIRDEEN (*Todupuzha taluk*) said that the Tahsildars were responsible for considerable irregularity in the disposal of *puduval* and *poramboke* lands. He could cite specific instances from the Todupuzha taluk. The following instances were in point :—

(i) The grant of lands in Survey No. 165/1 of the Karimannoor *pakuthi* to Mr. C. R. Kesava Pillai, Medical Officer, Todupuzha,

(ii) the grant of several acres of land by the Todupuzha Tahsildar, Mr. Kesava Pillai, to Krishna Pillai of Mavelikara, a hotel keeper at Todupuzha, and

(iii) the grant of 11 cents of *poramboke* land in Survey No. 193/7 adjoining the Todupuzha market to a compounder.

The land in item (ii) above passed within a short period of time into the hands of Vakil Mr. Kesava Pillai of Mavelikara, a friend of the Tahsildar. The land fetched only Rs. 40 per acre, while the lands in the neighbourhood were sold at the rate of Rs. 150 to Rs. 200 per acre in open auction. From the sale of timber from the aforesaid land Mr. Kesava Pillai got Rs. 3,000.

The land referred to in item (iii) above was given gratis to the compounder on the recommendation of the Tahsildar. It formed the subject of personal investigation by the Officiating Dewan.

The disposal of *puduval* and *poramboke* lands in 1104 and 1105 by the Todupuzha Tahsildar was entirely irregular. The member prayed for a regular enquiry into the matter.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Pariathu Pakirdeen. One thing in general—I would say in regard to representations in this House. What I would suggest is something which I request all members to kindly remember. When you take up one or two particular instances—minor instances—in a particular locality or taluk and make that a subject of elaborate representation before an Assembly like this, it has to be considered and very seriously considered by you all whether it is not a waste of time. I would also suggest that, in making serious allegations of personal dishonesty against responsible officers, members have a duty which they owe to themselves as well as to the public, to make quite sure that such statements are true, before they give expression to them in an Assembly like this. Merely to say "I heard it said" or "I read it in some newspaper and therefore I am going to make a declaration that what is stated there is true", it seems to me, is a very light way of taking one's duties as a member of an august assembly like thi I am sure that members will be at one with me that such representations, instead of serving any useful purpose, will

defeat the very purpose for which an Assembly like this is constituted. The object of this Assembly is to enable the representatives of the people to state to the Government the real needs which the people of each locality feel, so that those needs might be taken into consideration by the Government and remedial measures adopted. Merely abusing people without apparently any foundation does not serve any useful purpose.

MEMBER: I shall produce evidence to support my statements.

DEWAN: You will perhaps have an opportunity for that. I am merely suggesting to members the desirability of making any statements for which they can personally vouch. In regard to the particular instance you have referred to, I may tell you that it will be enquired into.

7. Registry of lands in the Peermade taluk.

MR. C. A. ABDUL RAHIM (*Peermade taluk*) said that in his taluk there were vast areas of land fit for raising paddy and other crops, which were left as *tarisu*. He requested that those areas should be registered in the names of the inhabitants of the State at the minimum rate under the Puduval Rules. Only a quarter of the Vandammettu *Pakuthi* was wooded area, the rest being grass and swampy areas. The portion of the wooded area where there were valuable trees need alone be reserved and the remaining area should be thrown open for registry by cancelling the order of prohibition passed by Government in 1096.

Peermade was the centre of several commercial activities. Besides being the headquarters of a taluk with a First Class Magistrate's Court and some Government offices, it was daily resorted to by thousands of people for business. It was therefore very necessary that the grass lands lying waste in and around the town should be registered and assigned in small bits for constructing houses.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Abdul Rahim. I take it that your representation raised three points. The first point is the registry of lands within the cardamom reserve. As regards that, I might say that Government passed the order reserving that land for the benefit of the people of the State and the question of relaxing the strictness of that rule is being considered by Government.

Your second point is about the registry of lands outside the cardamom reserves wherever available. Such lands, when available for registry, are being registered and there is no prohibition against such registry.

Your third point is about the registry of house-sites in Peermade. There is absolutely no prohibition to the registry of house-sites in Peermade, and when any application is made to Government, they have absolutely no objection to register the land if it is available for registry.

MEMBER: But Government may raise some other objections.